UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

District of Minnesota

United States of America		
. V. Jamelle Davon Shoals)
Jainette Davon Shoats) Case No: <u>08cr232(12) (MJD/AJB)</u>
) USM No: <u>14063-041</u>
Date of Original Judgment:	11/18/2009) With the Lorent Color Patent
D. CD 1 1 1 1 1		(Xatherine Menendez, Office of the Federal Defender
Date of Previous Amended Judgment: (Use Date of Last Amended Judgment if Any)		Defender Defendant's Attorney
(Ose Dute of Bust Amenaca ouagment of 1119)		
ORDER REGARDING N	IOTION F	OR SENTENCE REDUCTION
PURSUAN	T TO 18 U	J.S.C. § 3582(e)(2)
Upon motion of ⊠ the defendant □ the D	irector of the I	Bureau of Prisons ☐ the court under 18 U.S.C.
§ 3582(c)(2) for a reduction in the term of imprisonment imposed based on a guideline sentencing range that has		
subsequently been lowered and made retroactive by the United States Sentencing Commission pursuant to 28 U.S.C.		
§ 994(u), and having considered such motion, and	d taking into ac	ccount the policy statement set forth at USSG §1B1.10
and the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C.	§ 3553(a), to th	he extent that they are applicable,
IT IS ORDERED that the motion is:		
□ DENIED. GRANTED and the d	efendant's prev	viously imposed sentence of imprisonment (as reflected in
the last judgment issued) of 48	n	months is reduced to 46
I. COURT DETERMINATION OF GUIDELI	NE RANGE ((Prior to Any Departures)
Previous Offense Level: 27	_	nded Total Offense Level: 23
Criminal History Category: I		riminal History Category: I
Previous Guideline Range: 70-87		mended Guideline Range: 46-57
II. SENTENCE RELATIVE TO THE AMEN	DED GUIDEL	LINE RANGE
$ \underline{\boxtimes} $ The reduced sentenced is within the amended s		
\Box The previous term of imprisonment imposed w	as less than the	e guideline range applicable to the defendant at the time
of sentencing as a result of a substantial assistance departure or Rule 35 reduction, and the reduced sentence is		
comparably less than the amended guideline range.		
The reduced sentence is above the amended gu	nderme range.	
II. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	. 40 11 7	determination" recording the amount of drugge
In considering a § 3582(c)(2) motion, this Court	is "bound by it	ts previous determination" regarding the amount of drugs
establishing the offense level. <u>United States v. Adams</u> , 104 F.3d 1028, 1030 (8th Cir. 1997). The Court must "leave all of its previous factual decisions intact when deciding whether to apply a guideline retroactively." <u>Id.</u> at 1031. Based on		
the facts available to the Court at the original time of sentencing, the Court concludes that there is no basis to hold		
Defendant accountable for more than 150 grams	of cocaine base	ee.
Except as otherwise provided, all provisions of the	ne judgment da	ated 11/18/2009 shall remain in effect.
TE IC CO ODDEDED	_	
IT IS SO ORDERED. $- 6 - 3$		Muhal .
order Date.		Judge's signature
Effective Date:		Michael J. Davis, Chief Judge, D. Minn.

(if different from order date)

Printed name and title